

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-6, 8-25, 27-33, and 35-42 are pending in this application.

In the July 17 Office Action, claim 39 was objected to due to an informality. As part of this amendment, claim 39 has been amended to correct the informality noted by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 39 be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 13-16, 27-28, 31-32, and 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,838,313 to Hou et al. (hereinafter "Hou") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,081,829 to Sidana (hereinafter "Sidana") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,105,055 to Pizano et al. (hereinafter "Pizano"). Claims 6, 8-13, 17-25, 33, 35-36, and 40-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hou, Sidana, and Pizano, in view of U.S. patent No. 6,009,462 to Birrel et al. (hereinafter "Birrel") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,526,407 to Russell et al. (hereinafter "Russell").

Applicant submits herewith a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 and supporting documentation to evidence that the invention was conceived in the United States prior to the March 13, 1998 filing date of U.S. Patent No. 6,105,055 to Pizano, and that a working prototype of the invention existed at least as early as April 23, 1998. Accordingly, the Pizano reference should be removed as a reference because it is not prior art.

D

In view of the §131 Declaration, the Pizano reference is removed as prior art. Given that all of the claims are rejected under §103 based in part on the Pizano reference, and no art rejection is made of any of the claims using any reference or combination of references that does not include the Pizano reference, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined references, without Pizano, do not disclose or suggest the pending claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Claims 1-6, 8-25, 27-33, and 35-42 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 1/17/02

By: 

Allan T. Sponseller
Reg. No. 38,318
(509) 324-9256

D

Version of Claims with Markings to Show Changes Made

2. (Amended) A system as recited in claim 1, further comprising a media server to manage streaming the multimedia content to the client computer, wherein streaming the multimedia content comprises the multimedia content being communicated to the client computer on an as-needed basis rather than being pre-delivered in its entirety prior to beginning playback of the multimedia content.

39. (Three Times Amended) One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 37, wherein the located data [extracting annotation identification information] comprises [extracting from the email message]:

an identifier of media content to which the annotation content corresponds and of a temporal segment, corresponding to the annotation content, of the media content; and

an identifier of an annotation set that a new annotation including the extracted annotation content is to be part of, wherein the annotation set is one of a plurality of annotation sets corresponding to categories for annotations.

D